

The Acorn

A weekly newspublication presented as a service for the Drew University community by the students of the College of Liberal Arts.

Vote Yes On November 6

Vote yes on November 6? In a presidential election? Although we most heartily encourage all registered members of the Drew community to vote in the presidential, state, and county elections, that is not what we are referring to. This ballot is purely a student vote, which may seem inconsequential to many, yet it affects every student now at Drew, and even the incoming class of 1989. This is the student referendum on whether or not to increase the student activities fee by only \$10.

Although one's initial reaction may be, "why should I vote to increase my fees at Drew?" a realistic, and socially interested, unselfish attitude is needed to approach this more than necessary request. Are you at all interested in reading *The Acorn* every week? In receiving a yearbook every year? In listening to WMNJ when you wake up in the morning? Participating in the rugby, fishing, or investor's clubs? Or attending Comedy Night in the Pub? Do you even care that there is a student government association (SGA)?

If have an interest in any of this small, sample list or participate in one of the many other Extra Classroom Activities Board (E.C.A.B) funded clubs, you should realize that club funding was minimal for the 1984-85 year; in fact all clubs were required to submit a 1984-85 budget that was only 90% of their 1983-84 budget.

SGA President, Adam Glazer, who does not appear to be in favor of passing this referendum, himself received a budget that had originally been cut 35% from the previous year. True, the SGA was able to recapture some of these funds through an appeal process, but he as much as any other club head should be aware of the need for additional finances in E.C.A.B. pool. Most recently, Glazer went before ECAB to request funds to go to a student leaders convention in Chicago. Unfortunately, the board was only able to provide \$300 in funds for the trip, while loaning him an additional \$200 which must be paid back from whatever financial support he can acquire.

It seems to us that it is a pitiful state of affairs when the student board responsible for funding student activities cannot even afford to finance a venture they feel would enhance the quality of leadership at Drew. It also seems to be an ironic situation when a club head does not make every effort to support a proposal that would benefit his organization and, ultimately, every student on campus.

One suggestion that has been given more than its share of consideration is that the ECAB begin to make "hard decisions" about funding club activities, such as limiting the number of clubs it provides funding to. This is clearly foolish; it provides no freedom for development of new interests and activities, without limiting or eliminating those already in existence.

The plain truth is that the ECAB is dangerously underfinanced under the present arrangements. Instead of asking yourself why you should pay an extra \$10, why not instead ask yourself why you should limit your interests and activities? It's only \$10 to you, but it's another \$13,000 to your fellow students, and to yourself.

Once again: Vote Yes!

"Do you think, if you asked them, they might finish early...?"

L.G.

Special Thanks to John Loeser for de-bugging our computer hang-ups.

The Acorn

Letters

Student Comments On Reagan Policy

To the Editor:

The four-year Reagan deficit of \$730 billion is larger than the combined deficits of the Carter, Ford, Nixon, Johnson, Kennedy, Eisenhower, and Truman years. The total federal debt estimated at the end of 1985 is \$1.83 trillion. With an interest rate of 10 percent annually, the debt would be \$2.56 trillion by 1989. The 1985 current military budget will be 45.8%, or \$320 billion, up 13% from 1984.

Today, the combined ex-

plosive power of the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. equals 15 billion tons. 100 million tons would turn our earth into a dark frozen planet. Compare that to the 3 million tons that were dropped on US enemies during the six years of WWII.

The cost of one nuclear-powered submarine such as the recently launched "Henry Jackson" equals the annual education budget of 23 developing countries with 160 million school children.

In 1982, when American farmers were paid to take nearly 100 million acres of cropland out of production, 450 million people in the world were starving - Ethiopia as an example.

What are your priorities...Reagan's headlong rush toward Armageddon or Mondale's nuclear freeze/arms control? Save the planet on November 6. References furnished on request.

Kay L. Robinson, Jr.

Athlete Answers To Controversy

Editor's Note: The following letter appears as it was originally submitted. This letter was incorrectly printed in our October 12th issue. We regret any inconvenience or mis-information that may have occurred due to our error.

To the Editor:

I would like to comment on the recent revival of the field controversy, and on the letters in last week's *Acorn*.

It's no secret that Drew lacks adequate facilities, even for a high school. But is this the lacrosse teams' fault? The rugby teams? The baseball or womens soccer teams? Of course not, and neither is it the athletic director's fault. His position is one of trying to get the most out of the deteriorating fields while being told "We'll start breaking ground soon." As a friend commented: "You don't tool on the manager when you are upset with the owner."

I now turn to the letters in the last issue. While not trying to seem the great mediator, I feel that being a member of both the lacrosse team and rugby team, I have a unique perspective, and it really bothers me that some people feel that both teams can't coexist. I would like to clear up some points made.

In Mr. name withheld's letter he states the rugby team is constantly whining for a field; this is not true. The team has no problem with practicing wherever it can but would like to be able to use a field for a game if there is nothing scheduled on it.

Both letters made reference to an "illegal" rugby game, and criticize the

former captain who is no longer a student and cannot defend himself, but worse than that is both letters failed to state the circumstances. (Just as *The Acorn* failed to tell of the advantages that Drew was getting from allowing Madison soccer to use the field).

As many people know, or have heard, Drew rugby, which is in its 22nd year, is rich in tradition. One of these is the annual alumni game, which brings together players past and present for a day of rugby and remembering the good old days. Most players look forward to the game, and Bob's reply was stating his not being in charge of the alumni and of not wanting to rain on their parade. I am not trying to condone the unauthorized use of the field, but object to taking things out of context.

The first letter also takes the quote "it just won't work" and incorrectly refers to the "it" as being the contract, when it is actually referring to one of the makeshift goalposts. (By the way, nets are not used.) The club tried many alternatives to digging holes but when nothing worked, used a post hole digger to make the goal posts sturdy and safe, which is not in violation of the contract the rugby club signed.

Both letters also mentioned the destruction of the field in front of Mead Hall. All the fields have drainage problems but to say that the problem is the same is ridiculous; that field never dried out except late in the season when it froze. Also, last year there was a horse show on that field, which cannot be blamed on the D.R.F.C.

The second letter states

that there was no rugby representation at the leadership conference—of course there wasn't, and I doubt the athletic representation would have been as great without "suggestions" from the coaches. The rugby team had its first game that weekend, and if the authors of that letter feel that the leaders should have left their teammates (many of whom were playing their first game) to face a tough opponent such as Iona alone, then I'd say the authors should review their definition of leadership. And to throw in cheap shots such as "they were too busy digging holes" does nothing but lessen the strength of a letter that made some good points.

Finally, both letters mention rugby's offer of 'varsity' status, but varsity status would have meant the transfer of their budget to the athletic department and other concessions such as: "Home contests will be scheduled only in the fall, the athletic director will approve a schedule which does not conflict with other athletic activities on a priority of his choosing." Many players feel that Spring is the season. Point seven of the memorandum reads "the status of the rugby club remains a club sport." The last paragraph begins "I recognize that the tone of this memorandum does not permit much negotiation. That negotiation is intended." The club did not ignore the offer but felt that it could not accept it as it was.

If students want to solve the problem we must listen a little more and condemn a little less, and avoid creating animosities which need not exist.

Douglas McKernan